

Attorney's Docket No. 1008788-000053
Application No. 10/716,402
Page 12

REMARKS

The Office Action of April 11, 2008, has been carefully reviewed, and in view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the above Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1-5, 5-27 and 30 due to informalities. In addition, claims 1, 6-19, 21-24, 27 and 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Carrozzi et al. (EP 1 004 269) in view of DeMeester et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,081). Claims 2-4, 20, 25-26, 28, 30, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Carrozzi et al. in view of DeMeester et al. as applied above, and in further view of Tazaki (JP 11028199).

With respect to the informalities noted by the Examiner, the claims have been amended to address the same. With respect to claim 18, Applicants respectfully note that amended claim 1 recites that " the magnetic resonance apparatus has a magnet structure defining a cavity for accommodating a part of a body under examination...". Accordingly, Applicants submit that antecedent basis is provided for "the cavity" recited in claim 18.

Claim 1 as amended above sets forth that the base block of the magnetic resonance imaging is disposed on a platform interposed between the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus and the floor. The platform has a base plate and an upper magnetic resonance imaging apparatus supporting plate. The upper support plate lies over the base plate and rotary and sliding guide means are interposed between said two plates. Thus, the platform is rotatable along an annular path coaxial to an axis of the guide forming the curved connection between the patient

table and the magnetic imaging apparatus and the upper support plate is slidable relative to the base plate.

The primary reference upon which the Examiner relies, Carrozzi, does not disclose the base block of the MRI apparatus disposed on a platform having a base plate, upper supporting plate, or rotary and sliding guide means disposed therebetween. As clearly shown in Figure 4 of Carrozzi, the base block of the magnetic resonance imaging is disposed on stationary legs. The wheels 4 to which the Examiner refers in rejecting original claim 6 (page 3, last line of Office Action) are connected to the patient supporting table 2, not to the magnet 1.

The secondary reference cited by the Examiner, DeMeester, discloses that the magnet 20 is mounted on rollers or wheels 56 which engage a track 58 laid out on the floor.

Even combining the teachings of Carrozzi and DeMeester as proposed by the Examiner, one skilled in the art would not be led to the claimed invention. More specifically, there is no suggestion for an upper support plate which lies over a base plate and rotary and sliding guide means are interposed between the two plates. Still further, the prior art structure of DeMeester would appear to limit the movement of the magnet 20 to the track 58. There is no suggestion for a guide means which allows the platform to be rotatable along an annular path and which allows the upper support plate to be slidable relative to the base plate for translational movement as well. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the prior art relied upon by the Examiner does not render claim 1, or the claims depending therefrom, unpatentable.

Claim 34 recites at least one platform that rotates with an axis of rotation coaxial to an axis of the sector-shaped guide for the at least one of the tables, the

magnetic resonance imaging apparatus being positioned on said platform, whereas the table or tables have means allowing them to slide or roll directly on the floor. The prior art relied upon by the Examiner fails to suggest the rotary displacement of the MRI apparatus via a platform as claimed, wherein the table(s) are separately disposed directly on the floor. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 34 and the claims depending therefrom are also not rendered obvious by the cited prior art.

In rejecting claims 2-4, 20, 25-26, 28, 30, 32 and 33 in further view of Tazaki (JP 11028199), the Examiner contends that Tazaki discloses the use of multiple rotatable and variably positionable tables. Applicants respectfully disagree. A computer translation of Tazaki is submitted herewith for the Examiner's review. The translation clearly indicates, with reference to Figure 2, that one patient table 6 is moved to locations P1-P6. Hence, Tazaki fails to provide a suggestion for the simultaneous connection of two or more tables. Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art fails to suggest two or more tables that can be positioned relative to each other and to the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus, as recited in claims 2, 28 and 34.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the present application are now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is earnestly solicited.

Attorney's Docket No. 1008788-000053
Application No. 10/716,402
Page 15

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application; the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned counsel for Applicant regarding the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: September 11, 2008

By:



Wendi L. Weinstein
Registration No. 34456

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted by facsimile transmission to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, to the following facsimile number.

Facsimile Number: 571-273-8300


Typed Name: Wendi L. Weinstein

Date of Transmission: September 11, 2008